

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-15, 21, 23-35, 41-43, and 45-55 are pending. Claims 16-20, 36-40, and 44, which were previously withdrawn in response to a restriction requirement, have now been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 5, 11, 12, 14, 21, 25-27, 29-35, and 41-43 have been amended. New claims 45-55 have been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Applicants submit that the pending are patentable over the art of record and allowance is respectfully requested of claims 1, 3-15, 21, 23-35, 41-43, and 45-55.

During a telephone interview on July 3, 2007, Examiner Prenell indicated that she would like to restrict the claims into two groups: claims 1-15, 21-25, and 41-43 (Group I) and 16-20, 36-40, and 44 (Group II). Applicants' representative, Janaki K. Davda, is affirming that she elected the claims of Group I without traverse and withdrew the claims of Group II. The claims of Group II have been cancelled without prejudice herein.

The Specification is objected to. Applicants have amended the Abstract to overcome the objection.

Claims 21-32, 41, and 42 are objected because of informalities. In particular, Applicants respectfully traverse, but, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims to overcome the objection.

Claims 1-15, 21-35, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse, but, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended certain claims.

In particular, the Examiner states on page 4 of the Office Action:

Although the claims themselves are represented as statutory, Applicant discloses and defines on page 16 of the specification that the "article of manufacture in which the code is implemented may comprise a transmission media, signals propagating through space, radio waves, infrared signals," which appears to be directed toward a signal, and is therefore non-statutory. (Emphasis added.)

Applicants Specification on page 16, paragraph 51, states:

The term "article of manufacture" as used herein refers to code or logic implemented in hardware logic (e.g., an integrated circuit chip, Programmable Gate Array (PGA), Application Specific Integrated Circuit (ASIC), etc.) or a computer readable medium, such as magnetic storage medium (e.g., hard disk drives, floppy disks,, tape, etc.), optical storage (CD ROMs, optical disks, etc.), volatile and non volatile memory devices (e.g., EEPROMs, ROMs, PROMs, RAMs, DRAMs, SRAMs, firmware, programmable logic, etc.).

Thus, Applicants have amended claims 1, 12, and 14 to recite an "article of manufacture embodied as one of hardware logic and a computer readable storage medium". Also, Applicants' have amended claims 21, 32, and 34 to recite a "computer readable storage medium".

Applicants do not understand why the method claims 41, 42, and 43 have been rejected based on the language in the Specification regarding an article of manufacture. If this rejection is maintained, Applicants' respectfully request clarification on this rejection in the next Office Action.

Claims 1-14, 21-35, 41, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alon et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0262233) in view of Nori et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0049993). Applicants respectfully traverse, but, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended certain claims.

Amended claims 1, 21, and 41 describe scanning a network data store for at least one transaction, wherein said transaction includes one of connecting components in said network, adding components to said network, updating components in said network, and rezoning components in said network (e.g., Specification, page 8, paragraph 26); generating at least one event for said transaction using a mapping of events to transactions (e.g., Specification, page 11, paragraph 35); for said event, obtaining configuration data associated with components in said transaction (e.g., Specification, page 8, paragraph 27); generating at least one trigger for said event, wherein said trigger is associated with at least one configuration policy (e.g., Specification, pages 8-9, paragraphs 28-29); comparing said configuration policy associated with said trigger with said configuration data associated with said event for which said trigger

was generated (e.g., Specification, page, 9, paragraph 30); and determining whether said configuration policy has been violated based on the comparison.

As to scanning a network data store for at least one transaction, wherein said transaction includes one of connecting components in said network, adding components to said network, updating components in said network, and rezoning components in said network, the Examiner indicates that Alon is silent on scanning a network data store for at least one transaction (page 5 of Office Action). The Examiner cites the Nori patent application at paragraph 523. Paragraph 523 describes scanning the data store for changes. However, this does not teach or suggest scanning a network data store for at least one transaction, wherein said transaction includes one of connecting components in said network, adding components to said network, updating components in said network, and rezoning components in said network.

As to generating at least one event for said transaction using a mapping of events to transactions, the Examiner cites the Alon patent application, paragraphs 17 and 20. The Alon patent application describes events, but the Alon patent application does not teach or suggest generating at least one event for said transaction using a mapping of events to transactions.

Also, amended claims 1, 21, and 41 describe, for said event, obtaining configuration data associated with components in said transaction.

Amended claims 1, 21, and 41 describe generating at least one trigger for said event, wherein said trigger is associated with at least one configuration policy. The Alon patent application in paragraph 84 describes the earliest component event (root cause) identified in step 418 is assumed to have been the trigger event. However, this does not teach or suggest generating at least one trigger for said event, wherein said trigger is associated with at least one configuration policy.

Amended claims 1, 21, and 41 describe comparing said configuration policy associated with said trigger with said configuration data associated with said event for which said trigger was generated and determining whether said configuration policy has been violated based on the comparison. The Alon patent application identifies the root cause of an access path violation, where a root cause is defined as an event in the network fabric that causes a violation of access path policy, without being itself caused by an earlier, correctly time-stamped event that violated the access path policy (paragraph 78). Such a determination teaches away from comparing said configuration policy associated with said trigger with said configuration data associated with said

event for which said trigger was generated and determining whether said configuration policy has been violated based on the comparison.

Thus, claims 1, 21, and 41 are not taught or suggested by the Alon or Nori patent applications, either alone or in combination.

Amended claims 12, 32, and 42 describe receiving a hypothetical network scenario, wherein said hypothetical network scenario represents a new network configuration that a system administrator wants to create (e.g., Specification, page 8, paragraph 25); generating at least one transaction based on said hypothetical network scenario, wherein said transaction includes one of connecting components in said hypothetical network scenario, adding components to said hypothetical network scenario, updating components in said hypothetical network scenario, and rezoning components in said hypothetical network scenario (e.g., Specification, page 8, paragraph 26); populating a network data store with configuration data for said transaction, wherein said configuration data includes configuration data for components in said hypothetical network scenario described by said transaction (e.g., Specification, pages 9-10, paragraph 31); generating at least one event for said transaction using a mapping of events to transactions; and using configuration data associated with said event to determine whether a configuration policy has been violated.

On page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner submits that, although Alon is silent on receiving a hypothetical network scenario, Nori discloses a hypothetical shared folder, which is a hypothetical scenario. Applicants respectfully traverse. The Nori patent application describes that a community folder is an abstraction that represents a hypothetical "shared folder" that all community members are synchronizing with (paragraph 565). Such a folder does not teach or suggest receiving a hypothetical network scenario, wherein said hypothetical network scenario represents a new network configuration that a system administrator wants to create.

Amended claims 12, 32, and 42 describe generating at least one transaction based on said hypothetical network scenario, wherein said transaction includes one of connecting components in said hypothetical network scenario, adding components to said hypothetical network scenario, updating components in said hypothetical network scenario, and rezoning components in said hypothetical network scenario. Paragraph 523 of the Nori patent application describes scanning the data store for changes. However, this does not teach or suggest scanning a network data

store for at least one transaction, wherein said transaction includes one of connecting components in said network, adding components to said network, updating components in said network, and rezoning components in said network.

Amended claims 12, 32, and 42 describe populating a network data store with configuration data for said transaction, wherein said configuration data includes configuration data for components in said hypothetical network scenario described by said transaction (e.g., Specification, pages 9-10, paragraph 31). The Nori patent application is cited at paragraph 967. Paragraph 967 describes value constraints that are evaluated on the store. This does not teach or suggest describe populating a network data store with configuration data for said transaction, wherein said configuration data includes configuration data for components in said hypothetical network scenario described by said transaction.

Amended claims 12, 32, and 42 describe generating at least one event for said transaction using a mapping of events to transactions. The Alon patent application describes events, but the Alon patent application does not teach or suggest generating at least one event for said transaction using a mapping of events to transactions.

Amended claims 12, 32, and 42 describe using configuration data associated with said event to determine whether a configuration policy has been violated. The Alon patent application identifies the root cause of an access path violation, where a root cause is defined as an event in the network fabric that causes a violation of access path policy, without being itself caused by an earlier, correctly time-stamped event that violated the access path policy (paragraph 78). Such a determination teaches away from describe using configuration data associated with said event to determine whether a configuration policy has been violated.

Thus, claims 12, 32, and 42 are not taught or suggested by the Alon or Nori patent applications, either alone or in combination.

Amended claims 14, 34, and 43 describe receiving a request to perform configuration checking on an existing network configuration; scanning a network data store for at least one transaction, wherein said transaction includes one of connecting components in said network, adding components to said network, updating components in said network, and rezoning components in said network; generating at least one event for said transaction using a mapping of events to transactions; and using configuration data associated with said event to determine

whether a configuration policy has been violated by determining whether the at least one transaction results in incompatibilities, performance issues, and availability issues, wherein said incompatibilities are conflicts between components in the network, said performance issues relate to whether a desired performance level is met, and said availability issues relate to whether there is a single point of failure in the network (page 10, paragraph 32).

The Nori and Alon patent applications do not teach or suggest scanning a network data store for at least one transaction, wherein said transaction includes one of connecting components in said network, adding components to said network, updating components in said network, and rezoning components in said network, and generating at least one event for said transaction using a mapping of events to transactions at least for the same reasons as were discussed with reference to claims 1, 12, 41, and 42.

Amended claims 14, 34, and 43 describe using configuration data associated with said event to determine whether a configuration policy has been violated by determining whether the at least one transaction results in incompatibilities, performance issues, and availability issues, wherein said incompatibilities are conflicts between components in the network, said performance issues relate to whether a desired performance level is met, and said availability issues relate to whether there is a single point of failure in the network. The Alon patent application describes that logical access paths can include associated path attributes which can be considered as particular properties that characterize each end-to-end Logical Access Path, describing, for example, aspects of availability, performance and security of each given end-to-end logical channel (paragraph 38). Moreover, the Alon patent application identifies the root cause of an access path violation, where a root cause is defined as an event in the network fabric that causes a violation of access path policy, without being itself caused by an earlier, correctly time-stamped event that violated the access path policy (paragraph 78). However, such a determination teaches away from using configuration data associated with said event to determine whether a configuration policy has been violated by determining whether the at least one transaction results in incompatibilities, performance issues, and availability issues, wherein said incompatibilities are conflicts between components in the network, said performance issues relate to whether a desired performance level is met, and said availability issues relate to whether there is a single point of failure in the network.

Thus, claims 14, 34, and 43 are not taught or suggested by the Alon or Nori patent applications, either alone or in combination.

Dependent claims 3-11, 13, 23-31, and 33 incorporate the language of independent claims 1, 12, 21, and 32 and add additional novel elements. Therefore, dependent claims 3-11, 13, 23-31, and 33 are not taught or suggested by the Alon or Nori patent Applications, either alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claims 1, 12, 21, and 32.

Also, amended claims 5 and 25 describe receiving a hypothetical network scenario, wherein said hypothetical network scenario represents a new network configuration that a system administrator wants to create; generating at least one transaction based on the hypothetical network scenario; populating the network data store with configuration data for said transaction; and after determining whether said configuration policy has been violated based on the comparison, rolling back said transaction. On page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner submits that, although Alon is silent on receiving a hypothetical network scenario, Nori discloses a hypothetical shared folder, which is a hypothetical scenario. Applicants respectfully traverse. The Nori patent application describes that a community folder is an abstraction that represents a hypothetical "shared folder" that all community members are synchronizing with (paragraph 565). Such a folder does not teach or suggest receiving a hypothetical network scenario, wherein said hypothetical network scenario represents a new network configuration that a system administrator wants to create.

Amended claims 11 and 31 describe that the operations for determining whether said configuration policy has been violated further comprise identifying incompatibilities between components in the network, performance issues, and availability, wherein said incompatibilities are conflicts between components in said network, said performance relates to whether a desired performance level is met, and said availability relates to whether there is a single point of failure in said network. The Examiner cites paragraphs 38-40 and 70-84 of the Alon patent application. The Alon patent application describes that logical access paths can include associated path attributes which can be considered as particular properties that characterize each end-to-end Logical Access Path, describing, for example, aspects of availability, performance and security of each given end-to-end logical channel (paragraph 38). However, this does not teach or

suggest identifying incompatibilities between components in the network, performance issues, and availability, wherein said incompatibilities are conflicts between components in said network, said performance relates to whether a desired performance level is met, and said availability relates to whether there is a single point of failure in said network.

Claims 15, 35, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alon et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0262233) in view of Nori et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0049993) and further in view of Beadles et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2007/0022124). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Amended claims 14, 34, and 42 are not taught or suggested by the Alon or Nori patent applications for the reasons discussed above. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the Beadles patent application does not cure the defects of the Nori patent application. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 14, 34, and 42 are not taught or suggested by a combination of the Alon, Nori, and Beadles patent applications.

Dependent claims 15 and 35 incorporate the language of independent claims 14 and 34, respectively, and add additional novel elements. Therefore, dependent claims 15 and 35 are not taught or suggested by the combination of the Alon, Nori, and Beadles patent applications.

Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alon et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0262233) in view of Nori et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0049993) and further in view of DiFalco et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0278191). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Amended claim 43 describes receiving a request to perform configuration checking on an existing network configuration; scanning a network data store for at least one transaction, wherein said transaction includes one of connecting components in said network, adding components to said network, updating components in said network, and rezoning components in said network; generating at least one event for said transaction using a mapping of events to transactions; and using configuration data associated with said event to determine whether a configuration policy has been violated by determining whether the at least one transaction results in incompatibilities, performance issues, and availability issues, wherein said incompatibilities are conflicts between components in the network, said performance issues relate to whether a



desired performance level is met, and said availability issues relate to whether there is a single point of failure in the network (e.g., Specification, pages 10-11, paragraphs 32 and 34).

The Examiner states that Alon and Nori are silent on reactive configuration checking, and cites the DiFalco patent application. If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to cite specific portions of the DiFalco patent application in the next Office Action. The DiFalco patent application describes management of a data processing environment and describes facilitating homogenous monitoring of a plurality of heterogeneous data processing nodes of the data processing environment (Abstract). Applicants respectfully submit that claim 43 is not taught or suggested by the combination of the Alon, Nori, and DiFalco patent applications.

Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 45-55 are not taught or suggested by the cited references for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claims 3-11, 13, and 15 discussed above.

#### Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicants submit that the pending claims 1, 3-15, 21, 23-35, 41-43, and 45-55 are patentable. Should any additional fees be required beyond those paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0466.

The attorney of record invites Examiner Prenell to contact her at (310) 553-7973 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: November 19, 2007

By:     /Janaki K. Davda/    

Janaki K. Davda  
Registration No. 40,684

Please direct all correspondences to:

Janaki K. Davda  
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP  
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Tel: (310) 553-7973  
Fax: 310-556-7984